



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1430
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,702	08/05/2003	Vincent Alan Larsen	SAGE-26,401	8390
758	7590	07/27/2006	EXAMINER	
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			LY, CHEYNE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,702	LARSEN, VINCENT ALAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheyne D. Ly	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24, 27-31, 34-38, 41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 25, 26, 32, 33, 39 and 40 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/04/04; 3/30/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' arguments filed May 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.
2. Claims 22-42 are examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 22, 23, 28-30, 35-37, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Park et al. (February 2001) (Park hereafter).
5. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 22, 23, 28-30, 35-37, and 42, as recited in the previous office action mailed February 09, 2006. Applicant arguments have been responded to as discussed below.
6. In regard to claim 22, Park discloses a method of providing access to a resource of a computer (page 63, Figure 16), comprising:
 - a. Receiving a request from a user to access the resource using a process (page 63, lines 19-23, and Figures 16 and 18);

- b. Assessing data associated with the user stored in a memory in response to the received request (page 63, section 6.2), the data specifying one or more resources available to the process (page 65, Figure 18, step 7); and
 - c. Providing the process with access to the resource if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process (page 64, lines 1-8, and page 65, Figure 18, step 7).
- 7. In regard to claim 23, the data stored in the memory comprises a process resource access table for the process and associated with the user, the process resource access table specifying an access right of the process to the resource (page 64, lines 1-8).
- 8. In regard to claim 28, the computer is utilized by a plurality of users (page 63, section 6.2), further comprising:
 - a. Determining an identity of the user (page 63, section 6.2); and
 - b. Identifying data stored in the memory specifying resources available to processes executed by the user having the determined identity (page 64, lines 1-8).
- 9. In regard to claims 29, 30, 35-37, and 42, Park discloses the system and computer program product (pages 63-65) for implementing the above-cited method.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT

- 10. On pages 7-9, Applicant argues that Park et al. does not describe the claimed invention because the disclosure of Park et al. is directed to the resource that is available to “the role of the user”, however, not to the process as claimed. Applicant’s argument is not persuasive because the instant specification does not explicitly define the limitation of “process.” Therefore, the limitation of process has been attributed with the customary

Art Unit: 2168

and ordinary meaning of a program or part of a program or a coherent sequence of steps undertaken by a program as appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art. Park et al., as cited above, discloses a RBAC as processed and communicated between a role server, client browser, and web server (pages 42 and 43, Figures 2 and 3). The cited disclosure reasonably anticipates the argued limitation as appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art.

11. Claims 22-24, 27, 29-31, 34, 36-38, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Trabelsi et al. (December 2001) (Trabelsi hereafter).
12. It is noted that the rejection, as previously recited, had inadvertently stated that the claims are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(2). The statement of “rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(2)” was an inadvertent typographical error. The instant rejection of record is under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). The citation of the prior art remains identical to the previously cited prior art.
13. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 22-24, 27, 29-31, 34, 36-38, and 41, as recited in the previous office action mailed February 09, 2006. Applicant arguments have been responded to as discussed below.
14. In regard to claim 22, Trabelsi discloses a method of providing access to a resource of a computer (page 2, paragraph ([0024]), comprising:
 - a. Receiving a request from a user to access the resource using a process (page 2, paragraph ([0026]));

- b. Assessing data associated with the user stored in a memory in response to the received request (page 2, paragraphs ([0027]-[0030], and page 3, paragraph [0051]), the data specifying one or more resources available to the process (page 3, paragraph [0043]); and
- c. Providing the process with access to the resource if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process (page 2, paragraph [0036] and page 3, paragraph [0046]).

15. In regard to claim 23, the data stored in the memory comprises a process resource access table for the process and associated with the user, the process resource access table specifying an access right of the process to the resource (Figures 2-4).

16. In regard to claim 24, the process resource access table includes a directory path, and wherein the process has access rights to a resource designated by the directory path (Figures 2-4).

17. In regard to claim 27, the resource of the computer comprises one or more resources from the set consisting of: a data file, an application file, a digital device (page 1, paragraph [0019] and [0020]), and access to functionality provided by a second process executing on the computer (pages 1-2, paragraph [0021] and [0022]).

18. In regard to claims 29-31, 34, 36-38, and 41, Trabelsi discloses the system and computer program product (page 1, [0017]) for implementing the above-cited method.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT

19. On pages 9-10, Applicant argues that Trabelsi et al. does not describe the claimed invention because the disclosure of Trabelsi et al. is directed to the resource that is available

Art Unit: 2168

to “the role of the user”, however, not to the “process” as claimed. Applicant’s argument is not persuasive because the instant specification does not explicitly define the limitation of “process.” Therefore, the limitation of process has been attributed with the customary and ordinary meaning of a program or part of a program or a coherent sequence of steps undertaken by a program as appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art. Trabelsi et al., as cited above, discloses a method for controlling access by a requestor, defined by roles, to resources as processed and communicated between workstations, servers, routers, and specialized machines and gateways between networks (page 1, [0009], and [0017]). The cited disclosure reasonably anticipates the argued limitation as appreciated by one of skill in the art.

CONCLUSION

20. Claims 25, 26, 32, 33, 39, and 40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to

Art Unit: 2168

37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


23. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

24. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The USPTO's official fax number is 571-272-8300.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

Art Unit: 2168

26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo, can be reached on (571) 272-3642.

C. Dune Ly / 
Patent Examiner
7/18/06



TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100